

ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT

No. 06-662

NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

EDWIN MARTIN
Petitioner

v.

JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE AND
DISABILITY COMMISSION
Respondent

Opinion Delivered September 21, 2006

PRO SE PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI [JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE
AND DISABILITY COMMISSION
COMPLAINT NO. 06181]

PETITION DENIED

PER CURIAM

Petitioner Edwin Martin entered a plea of guilty in 2006 to terroristic threatening in the second degree and was sentenced to one year's probation and fined \$250.00. Petitioner subsequently filed a complaint with the Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission against the trial judge. On April 12, 2006, the Executive Director of the Commission informed petitioner that the complaint had been dismissed. On June 13, 2006, petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of *certiorari* seeking review by this court of the dismissal of the complaint.

We find no ground to grant a writ of *certiorari*. Rule 12 (F) of the Rules of Procedure of the Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission provides:

The Supreme Court may bring up for review any action taken upon any complaint filed with the Commission, and may also bring up for review a case in which the Commission has failed to act.

In *Duty v. Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission*, 304 Ark. 294, 801 S.W.2d 46 (1990), we construed this provision to limit review by this court to those instances where there is error on the face of the record. In brief, there is no *direct appeal* of a decision by the Commission available to the petitioner to have this court examine the merits of his complaint. Petitioner does not allege that there is error on the face of the record; instead, he states only that he is “enclosing court dates and court transcripts.”

Petition denied.